

On Inversion in *Wh*-questions in Romance

Pilar Barbosa

Universidade do Minho, Portugal

[In A. Hulk & J.-Y. Pollock (orgs.), *Romance Inversion*. New York: Oxford Press, 2001.]

1. Introduction

In most Romance languages, a subject may not intervene between a non d-linked *Wh*-argument and the inflected verb in main questions, as illustrated below for Standard Italian (Iberian Spanish, Romanian, European Portuguese and Catalan behave essentially the same way):

- (1) *Standard Italian* (Rizzi 1991):
- a. *Che cosa Maria ha detto?
What Maria has said
 - b. Che cosa ha detto Maria?
What has said Maria

A number of researchers (Rizzi and Roberts 1989, Rizzi 1991, 1995, Torrego 1984, Âmbar 1988, Raposo 1994, Uriagereka 1995 among many others) have proposed that obligatory adjacency between fronted *Wh*-arguments and inflection in Romance is due to overt Infl raising to the C-system. Under this approach, Romance inversion in questions is analysed on a par with English Subject-Aux inversion:

- (2) What (*Mary) has Mary said?

Romance and English would share the same strategy in questions: I-to-C movement applies, creating the required Spec-head configuration involving the *Wh*-element and the inflected verb.

Even though it is tempting to give a unified account of English Subject-Aux inversion and Romance inversion, a straightforward extension of Germanic type inversion to Romance faces problems (see Uribe-Etxebarria 1991, Bonet 1990, Hulk 1993, Drijkoningen 1997, DeWind 1995, among others). A well known characteristic of V-second effects is the asymmetry between root and embedded environments. Thus in English Subject-Aux inversion does not apply in embedded questions. In Romance, by contrast, there is a great deal of variation. In Catalan, Romanian and Iberian Spanish, there is no root/embedded asymmetry: inflection must be strictly adjacent to the fronted *Wh*-argument in matrix as well as embedded questions. In Italian, judgements are shakier and appear to vary according to mood. In Portuguese and French, on the other hand, the order *Wh*-Subject-V is fine in embedded questions and alternates with inversion.

Studies on Catalan (Vallduví 1992, Bonet 1990, Sola 1992), Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994) and Iberian Spanish (Contreras 1991, Uribe-Etxebarria 1991, and Zubizarreta 1998) have claimed that the lack of root/embedded asymmetry observed in the phenomenon of obligatory adjacency between question operators and inflection in these languages should be analysed in terms of raising of the *Wh*-operator to Spec-IP rather than in terms of Infl raising to the C system. We thus have two different approaches to Romance *Wh*-triggered inversion and the question arises of whether a unified analysis of this phenomenon can be given.

My goal in this paper is to provide a unified account of the dissimilarities between Germanic and Romance *Wh*-triggered inversion while also capturing the different word order patterns found within Romance.

For English, I essentially assume Rizzi's (1991) analysis. In root questions, the locus of the [+wh] specification must be the head that contains the independent Tense specification of the whole sentence; I-to-C raises [+wh] Infl high enough so as to establish the required checking configuration. The occurrence of [+wh] in an embedded Comp is determined by lexical selection, so I-to-C doesn't need to take place.

The crucial property that distinguishes Romance from English is that [+wh] Infl does not raise up to C. I will claim that the *Wh*-criterion *can* be checked against the highest Infl head in *all* of Romance in root as well as in embedded clauses. I will adopt Pesetsky's (1982, 1992) proposal that categorial selection can be eliminated as an independent syntactic mechanism. This proposal is developed in Bos*kovic* 1996 (see also Grimshaw 1993), who suggests that, as long as CP status is not required by lexical properties or other constraints independent of c-selection, clausal complements may be IPs. I will present evidence in support of Bos*kovic*'s proposal and I will defend the view that clausal projections may be bare IPs unless further structure is independently required.

Since the *Wh*-criterion can be satisfied at the IP level in Romance, root questions may be bare IPs. Obligatory adjacency between Infl and the *Wh*-constituent follows. The subject may stay in situ, yielding the order *Wh*-(Aux)-V-Subject:

- (3) $[_{IP} \text{ } Wh\text{-operator } [_I \text{ } [_{I[+wh]} V] \text{ } \dots [_{VP} \text{ subject }]]$

I will follow recent proposals (Barbosa 1995, Pollock 1997, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998) according to which the Null Subject Languages are languages in which rich agreement checks the EPP and the N-features of Infl. In these languages, Spec-IP is not an A-position. The real A-position occupied by subjects is post-verbal. Whenever lexical subjects appear to the left of inflection, they are either left-dislocated topics doubled by subject *pro*, or, if they belong to a restricted class of QPs that cannot be topics, they are A'-moved to Spec-IP. In the absence of A'-movement to Spec-IP, Infl doesn't project a specifier. This property will account for certain differences between French and the other Romance languages. In the latter, Spec-IP doesn't necessarily need to be filled in overt syntax. In French the EPP can only be satisfied by overt raising to Spec-IP.

One important difference distinguishes French from English, however. In French, the EPP feature doesn't necessarily need to be checked by a subject: a *Wh*-phrase in Spec-IP may satisfy *both* the *Wh*-criterion and the EPP. Hence, both root and embedded questions may be bare IPs in French as long as the subject is allowed to stay in situ. When the subject raises in overt syntax, however, CP must project.

In the Null Subject Romance languages, embedded questions can also in principle be bare IPs (*Wh*-checking can be done against the highest T head), but they can involve additional layers depending on whether the Topic\Focus layer is activated. The cross-linguistic variation detected with respect to the adjacency requirement between the *Wh*-constituent and inflection is due to variation in the structure of the 'left-periphery', combined with the featural make up of complementizers in the inventory of each language.

2. The Structure of the "Left-Periphery"

Based on a study of the interactions among the elements that typically involve the left-periphery of the clause, Rizzi 1997 argues for an articulated CP layer minimally consisting of two independent heads: the higher head is a specification of *Force*, basically encoding clause type, and the lower one encodes *Finiteness* (in the spirit of Holmberg and Platzack 1988). Evidence for the need to distinguish the two comes from the distribution of Clitic Left Dislocated topics with respect to the complementizer *che* and the prepositional element introducing infinitives, *di*. *Che* always precedes but *di* always follows a CLLDed phrase, as illustrated below:

- (4) a. Credo che il tuo libro, loro lo apprezzerebbero molto.
 'I believe that your book, they would appreciate a lot.'
- b. *Credo, il tuo libro, che loro lo apprezzerebbero molto.
 'I believe, your book, that they would appreciate a lot.'

- (5) a. Credo, il tuo libro, di apprezzarlo molto.
 ‘I believe DI your book to appreciate it a lot.’
 b. *Credo di, il tuo libro, apprezzarlo molto.

This distribution is unexpected if both *che* and *di* occupy a unique C position, but is readily accounted for under a split C system, where *che* occupies a position higher than *di*. The Clitic Left Dislocated topic appears between the two positions. According to Rizzi, the impossibility of the occurrence of a topic between the Force head and the matrix verb is due to selection. Force bounds CP up and represents its interface with the superordinate structure. Fin bounds the clause downwards and represents the interface with the inflectional system. Topics, fronted *foci* and question operators occupy the space between ForP and FinP.

Before I turn to an investigation of the interactions among Topic, Focus and *Wh*-movement, I must first clarify what is meant by ‘topic’ and ‘fronted focus’. The topic-comment articulation is commonly expressed in Romance by the construction that Cinque 1990 has labelled Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD). In this construction, the topic constituent is placed in the front of the clause and is resumed by a clitic coreferential with it:

- (6) Il tuo libro, lo ho letto.
 ‘Your book, I read it’

In all of the Romance varieties under discussion with the exception of Portuguese, the clitic is obligatory when the topic is a direct object. In English, the topic-comment relation is expressed by the construction traditionally referred to as *Topicalization*. In this construction, the topic is associated with a gap:

- (7) Your book, you should give ec to Paul.

Among the Romance languages, Portuguese is the only one that has English-type Topicalization, as illustrated below (see Duarte 1987 and Raposo 1994, 1996a,b). This option coexists with CLLD:

- (8) O teu livro, comprei de certeza.
'Your book, I bought, for sure'

The focus-presupposition articulation can be expressed in many Romance languages by preposing the focal element and assigning it special stress (see Cinque 1990, Rizzi 1997 for discussion of the properties of this construction in Italian):

- (8) IL TUO LIBRO ho letto (, non il suo)
'Your book (focus) I have read (not his)'
[Rizzi 1997]

(8) is restricted to contrastive focus. Other Romance languages that have been described to have equivalents to (8) are Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994), Spanish (Torrego 1984, Laka 1990, Contreras 1991, Uribe-Etxebarria 1991, Uriagereka 1995, Raposo 1994, 1996a,b, Zubizarreta 1998) and Catalan (Vallduví 1992, Sola 1992, Bonet 1990).

A number of properties distinguish CLLD from Focus. The main superficial difference is that a 'resumptive' clitic is impossible with a focalized object but is obligatory with a CLLD object. As discussed in Cinque 1990, Iatridou 1991, Tsimpli 1994, Rizzi 1997, Raposo 1996a,b the differences detected between CLLD and Focus point to the conclusion that Focus is akin to *Wh*-movement whereas CLLD involves some different form of construal. Focus fronting passes all of the diagnostics for *Wh*-movement: it reconstructs, it proceeds successive cyclically and it displays Weak Cross-over effects. CLLD, on the other hand, doesn't display any of these properties. Therefore, I

will assume that Focus is a genuine case of movement whereas CLLDed topics are merged directly in their surface position.

One important property that distinguishes CLLD from Focus is that there can be multiple topics per clause but only one focus:

- (10) Il libro, a Gianni, domani, glielo darò senz'altro.
 'The book, to John, tomorrow, to him-it will give for sure'
- (11) *A GIANNI IL LIBRO darò (non a Pero, l' articolo)
 [Rizzi 1997]

In Italian, topics are not strictly ordered with respect to Focus, they may precede or follow the unique Focused constituent:

- (12) a. Credo che QUESTO, a Gianni, gli dovremmo dire.
 'I believe that to Gianni, THIS, we should say'
- b. Credo che a Gianni, QUESTO, gli dovremmo dire
 [Rizzi 1997]

Iatridou 1991 and Raposo 1996a,b propose that CLLDed topics are licensed by "rules of predication" (see Chomsky 1977) that require that the topic be 'base-generated' in a position of adjunction to the XP that is predicated of it. Under such an analysis, CLLDed topics are freely adjoined to a clausal projection. Deriving the properties of Focus from movement theory, and assuming that a unique focal head can project between C and IP, (12a,b) are analysed in terms of free adjunction of the topic to IP or FocP:

- (13) a. [_{CP}che [_{FocP} QUESTO_k [_{Foc} ∅ [_{IP} a Gianni [_{IP} gli dovremmo dire t_k]]]]]
 b. [_{CP}che [_{FocP}[a Gianni [_{FocP} QUESTO_k [_{Foc} ∅ [_{IP} gli dovremmo dire t_k]]]]]]

The different possibilities allowed follow from the fact that there are at least two clausal projections available to function as predicates in Italian: IP or FocP ¹.

Integrating Topic and Focus in the Force-Finiteness system defended in Rizzi 1997, we have the following maximally expanded CP layer for Italian:

(14) Force (Topics*) (Focus) (Topics*) Fin IP

For Rizzi, the Force-Finiteness system is always projected, but the Topic-Focus system is only projected when needed. With the hierarchical structure (14) in mind, we are now in a position to turn to the issue of the landing site of *Wh*-movement in Romance.

3. *The landing site(s) of question operators in Romance*

There is pretty robust evidence that question operators in Romance target a position that is lower than the position filled by relative operators. As discussed in Sola (1992), Raposo (1996), Rizzi (1995), Poletto (1997), relative operators must precede topics, but question operators must follow topics in main questions. The following examples illustrate the case of Italian, but the other Romance languages behave alike:

(15) *Relative operator > Topic*

Un uomo **a cui**, *il premio Nobel*, lo daranno senz'altro.

'A man to whom, the nobel Prize, they will give it indoubtably.'

¹ Rizzi 1997 adopts a different take on the matter of topics. In the spirit of Kayne's (1994) proposal according to which mutual c-command is excluded from the grammar, Rizzi postulates a recursive Top node which projects its own X' schema. This Top node 'defines a kind of "higher predication"'. The differences between Topic and Focus are due to the kind of relation established between the phrase in an A'-position (Topic or Focus) and the element in argument position. Configurationally, there is no difference between Topic and Focus. Interpretive constraints prevent FocusP from being recursive and allow recursion of TopicP. In section 4, we will see that a configurational difference between Focus and Topic is crucial in the analysis of the distribution of the subjunctive complementizer *ca* in Romanian (Boskovic 1996). We will see that the distribution of *ca* depends on the assumption that Topics are in a position of adjunction whereas Focus fronting involves substitution into specifier. For this reason, I adopt the analysis described in text instead of Rizzi's.

- (16) **Topic* > *Relative operator*
 * Un uomo, *il premio Nobel*, **a cui** lo daranno senz' altro.
- (17) *Topic* > *Wh-phrase*
- a. *Il premio Nobel*, **a chi** lo daranno?
 The Nobel Prize to whom it gave.3pl
 'To whom did they give the Nobel Prize?'
- b. ***A chi**, *il premio Nobel*, lo daranno?

Since Force is the one CP head that cannot be preceded by topics, the contrasts above are explained under the assumption that relative operators target Spec-ForceP whereas question operators target a lower position.

Martins 1994, Uriagereka 1995, Raposo 1994, 1996a,b, and Rizzi 1997 propose that question operators target the Spec of FocP, located between C and IP (or FinP, in Rizzi's more fine-grained analysis). Infl-to-Foc raising triggered by the requirement to check the *Wh*-feature accounts for obligatory adjacency between the question operator and inflection in root clauses:

- (18) [_{FocP} Q-operator [_{Foc} Infl+V] [_{IP} t] ...]
- ↑

Assuming that, in main questions, the [wh] feature is located in T and that *Wh*-movement targets Spec-Foc, then T must raise up to Foc so as to satisfy the *Wh*-Criterion.

A long-standing problem for the Infl raising approach to the phenomenon of obligatory adjacency between inflection and question operators in Romance is that the order Aux-Subject-V is often impossible, as illustrated below for Italian and French:

- (19) *Italian*:
- a. *Che cosa ha Maria detto?
 What has M said M
- b. Che cosa ha detto Maria?

(20) *French:*

- a. *Où est Marie allée?
Where is M. gone
- b. Où est allée Marie?
'Where did Mary go?'

The examples above show a very different pattern from Germanic. Whereas the Germanic languages freely allow the order *Wh-Aux-Subject*, the Romance languages mentioned do not let the lexical subject immediately follow the inflected Aux. If inflection raises across the subject, one would expect the subject to be allowed to appear immediately after the auxiliary, as happens in English².

A quick survey of the restrictions on the placement of lexical subjects immediately to the right of auxiliaries in Romance reveals that the pattern observed in declaratives is systematically kept in interrogatives. Starting with Italian, we observe that the order *Aux-Subject-Prt* is barred in declaratives as well as interrogatives:

- (21) a. *Ha Mario accettato di aiutarci.
has Mario accepted to help us [Rizzi 1982]

² This problem is noted in Rizzi and Roberts 1989, and Rizzi 1991. In view of the observation that adverbs and floating quantifiers may appear immediately to the right of Aux, these authors conclude that the restriction in question cannot be due to incorporation of the Aux with the participle and propose a Case theoretic solution. In particular, they suggest that I-to-C movement destroys the context of Nominative Case assignment, which, in Romance, would be limited to the Spec-head configuration with Agr. Hence (7a), (8a) and (9a) are ruled out because the subject fails to be checked for Case. This solution, however, is clearly unsatisfactory. In the first place it raises the question of why I-to-C movement should interfere with Case checking in Romance though not in Germanic. Secondly, it immediately runs into problems when we consider other cases that arguably involve I-to-C and yet allow the order *Aux-Subject-Participle*. The relevant paradigm is the following (from Rizzi 1982):

- (i) a. Se lui avesse capito al volo, tutto sarebbe andato bene.
"If he had understood immediately, everything would have gone smoothly."
b. *Se avesse lui capito al volo, tutto sarebbe andato bene.
c. Avesse lui capito al volo, tutto sarebbe andato bene.
d. *Se lui avesse capito al volo, tutto sarebbe andato bene.

The paradigm above shows that the order *Aux-Subject-Participle* is possible just in case the complementizer is absent (compare (ib) with (ic)). Taking complementary distribution with an overt complementizer as a test for I-to-C, we conclude that this movement does not interfere with nominative

- b. *Che cosa ha Maria detto?
What has M said

Turning to Spanish, where the availability of Aux-Subject-Prt order appears to depend on the form of the auxiliary, we observe that there is no asymmetry between questions and declaratives: the range of subject positions allowed in declaratives is kept in interrogatives. Consider the following examples:

- (22) a. Ha (*Juan) leído el libro (Juan).
Has J. read the book
- b. ?Había Juan leído casi todo el libro.
had J read almost all the book
- c. Esta Juan leyendo el libro (Juan).
Is J. reading the book
- [Maria-Luisa Rivero, p.c.]

Aux-Subject-Prt order is unavailable with the third person present form of *haber*, *ha* (cf. 22a), but is marginally possible with the imperfect *pasthabia* (cf. 22b) while it is generally accepted when the auxiliary is *estar*. Now consider interrogatives:

- (23) a. Que ha (*Juan) leído (Juan)?
What has J. read J.
- b. ?Que había Juan leído ya?
What had J read already
- c. Que está (Juan) leyendo (Juan)?
What is J. reading [Maria-Luisa Rivero, p.c.]

Case checking in Italian. Hence the Case theoretic solution presented in Rizzi and Roberts (1989) is untenable (see Poletto 1997 for a similar point).

The restrictions on the distribution of subjects observed in declaratives are maintained in interrogatives. This lack of asymmetry between questions and declaratives casts doubt on the idea that inflection raises higher in questions.

Since there is no evidence for Infl raising in Romance, an alternative way of accounting for obligatory adjacency between inflection and question operators in Romance is by positing that question operators target the specifier position of the highest Infl head, as schematized below:

(24) [_{IP} Q-operator [_I [_I Infl+V] [_{VP} subject] ...]

↑ _____ |

The suggestion that question operators target Spec-IP has been made for Catalan (Vallduví 1992, Bonet 1990, Sola 1992 for Catalan), Iberian Spanish (Contreras 1991, Uribe-Etxebarria 1991 and Zubizarreta 1998) and Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994). In the next section, I will briefly review some of the arguments presented by these authors and in the sections that follow I will argue that this approach should be extended to all of the other Romance languages.

3.1 Catalan, Iberian Spanish and Romanian

In this section I will consider the Romance languages that show no embedded-root asymmetry in the adjacency requirement between inflection and a *Wh*-fronted element, namely Catalan, Iberian Spanish and Romanian. The following examples illustrate the fact that, in these Romance varieties, inflection must be adjacent to a *Wh*-element even in an embedded question:

- (25) a. *Catalan*: *V[*Wh*-S-V]
 ¿No sé **què** (*en Joan) farà (en Joan) [Sola 1992]
 Not know-1sg what (*Joan) will-do (Joan)

- b. *Romanian*:: *V[*Wh*-S-V]
 Nu ne-a spus **unde** (*Ion) s'a dus (Ion).
 'They didn't tell us where has gone Ion'
 [Dobrovie-Sorin 1994]
- c. *Spanish*: *V-*Wh*-S-V
 No sabía **qué** (*esos dos) querían (esos dos). [Torrego 1984]
 'I didn't know what those two wanted.'

The lack of root embedded/asymmetry observed in Iberian Spanish, Catalan and Romanian with regard to the adjacency requirement imposed between extracted arguments and inflection has led a number of linguists to suggest that Spec-IP is an A' position in these languages (see Vallduví 1992, Bonet 1990, Sola 1992 for Catalan; Contreras 1991, Uribe-Etxebarria 1991 and Zubizarreta 1998 for Iberian Spanish; Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 for Romanian). Here I will review Vallduví's 1992 discussion since it introduces yet another range of facts that will be useful in the discussion that follows.

Vallduví 1992 shows that in Catalan negative quantifiers and certain other quantifiers must be string adjacent to the verb when fronted. In this, they behave like fronted *Wh*-phrases and differently from CLLDed phrases, which do not need to be string adjacent to V. Consider a typical CLLD construction in Catalan (Vallduví 1992: 127):

- (26) [El sou]₁ [a la gent]₂ no l₁ hi₂ regalen.
 the pay to the people not it to-them give-3Pl
 'They don't give the pay to people for free.'

The two fronted constituents can be freely switched around:

- (27) [a la gent]₂ [el sou]₁ no l₁ hi₂ regalen.

Vallduví shows that if one of the two lefthand phrases is a negative quantifier, the linear order among the phrases is not free anymore (note that in Catalan a negative bare quantifier can be doubled by a clitic while still displaying this restriction):

- (28) a. El sou a ningú (no) l'hi regalen.
 the pay to noone (not) it to him give
 'They don't give the pay to anyone for free.'
 b. *A ningú el sou (no) l'hi regalen.

Subject negative quantifiers behave alike, as shown by the comparison between (29) and (30) below. In (29) subject and object may be switched around freely:

- (29) a. Els dolents l'empresa no els vol
 the bad-ones the company no them want
 'The company doesn't want the bad ones'
 b. L' empresa els dolents no els vol

When the subject is a negative quantifier, as in the sentences below, left-adjacency to the verbal string is required again:

- (30) a. Els dolents ningú (no) els vol
 Noone wants the bad ones.'
 b. *Ningú els dolens (no) els vol

Vallduví concludes the following: 'It is clear, then, that these negative quantifiers do not appear in the typical IP-adjunction slot left-detached phrases appear in, but rather in a position within IP which is left-adjacent to the verbal string. The left-adjacency requirement for *ningú* in (15) [our (30)] has nothing to do with the grammatical status as a subject, as shown by the fact that it also

applies in (14) [our (28)], where *ningú* is an indirect object. It is rather its status as a quantificational operator that appears to determine its inability to allow other lefthand phrases between itself and the verbal string. (Vallduví 1992: 328)'. According to Vallduví, this adjacency requirement doesn't affect all QPs, but a subset of them that includes *poques* N' ('few N'), *alguna cosa* 'something', *tothom* 'everyone', among others.

Vallduví further observes that the QPs in question are in complementary distribution with a pre-verbal *Wh*-phrase:

- (31) a. Què_i no regalen t_i a ningú?
 what not give 3PL to no-one
 'What don't they give to anyone for free?'
 b. *Què a ningú (no) li regalen?
 c. *A ningú què (no) li regalen?
- (32) a. Qui farà poques coses?
 who do-FUT-3SG few things
 'Who'll do few things?'
 b. *Qui poques coses farà ?
 c. *Poques coses qui farà ?

It is clear that these QPs and *Wh*-phrases occupy the same position. This suggests that the QPs in question are extracted by A-bar movement. Thus, there is a subset of quantified expressions that are fronted by A-bar movement *without requiring contrastive Focus* intonation. Vallduví refers to these QPs as "quantificational operators" and describes them as being incapable of functioning as "links". A "link phrase" 'points to the file card that it denotes in the file-structured knowledge-store of the hearer and selects it among the sentence participants as the sole point of information entry.' Hence, Vallduví's "link phrases" stand for discourse topics. The expressions that cannot be discourse topics range over QPs without a lexical restriction, nonspecific indefinites and [+ affective] operators.

In view of the fact that the position that *Wh*-phrases and fronted QPs occupy must be string adjacent to the verb but lower than complementizers, Vallduví suggests that it is Spec-IP. Schematically:

(33) $[_{CP} C [_{IP} XP [_{IP} wh +Op QP [_{I'} [_{I'} V] [_{VP} \dots]]]]]$

XP stands for left-adjoined topics (which may be construed with an object clitic or with subject *pro*) and Spec-IP is filled by either a fronted *Wh*-phrase or a “non-referential” QP (subject or object). Vallduví follows previous proposals according to which Catalan’s basic order is VOS (Adams 1987, Bonet 1990, Contreras 1991), so Spec-IP is empty and available for this role as a quantifier-related position.

The structure proposed in (33) also fits Iberian Spanish and Romanian. Recall that Romanian and Iberian Spanish are like Catalan in that they show no embedded root asymmetry with respect to the left-adjacency requirement imposed on *Wh*-questions. Moreover, in these languages, a Focused phrase must also be adjacent to inflection in matrix as well as in embedded clauses (see Zubizarreta 1998 for Iberian Spanish, Bonet 1990 for Catalan and Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, Motapanyane 1994 for Romanian)

- (34) a. Las ESPINACAS detesta **Pedro** (no las papas).
 [Zubizarreta 1998]
 The SPINACH hates P. (not the potatoes)
- b. *Las ESPINACAS **Pedro** trajo (no las papas)
 the SPINACH P. brought (not the potatoes)

Whenever a Focused phrase cooccurs with a topic, the latter must precede it (note that (35) contains a subject topic):

- (35) Estoy segura que Pedro, las ESPINACAS trajo (no las papas).
 I am sure that P. the SPINACH brought

- (36) Spunea că, scrisorile, IERI le-a primit, (nu azi)
 said that letters-the them has received (not today)
 [Motapanyane 1994]

Fronting of bare indefinites, indefinite QPs and negative QPs displays a similar restriction, as shown in Zubizarreta 1998 (Zubizarreta discusses the difference between QP fronting and Focus fronting, even though she labels the former type of movement “emphatic movement”):

- (37) a. ALGO debe haberte dicho Maria para que te hayas enojado tanto.
 something must have-to-you said Maria so that you have been so
 annoyed
 ‘Something Maria must have told you, for you to be so annoyed’
 b. ?*ALGO Maria te habrá dicho para que te hayas enojado tanto.
- (38) a. Con NADIE compartió María su secreto.
 With noone shared Maria her secret
 ‘Maria shared her secret with noone’
 b. ?*Con NADIE María compartió su secreto.

Under the assumption that there is only one A’-projection to the left of inflection, namely the Spec of the highest Infl head, the left-adjacency requirement imposed on all kinds of A’-extraction is immediately accounted for without recourse to Infl raising. As a result of the configuration in (33), topics will always precede *Wh*-phrases, *foci* or “non-specific” fronted QPs in matrix as well as embedded clauses.

The proposal that Spec-IP is the landing site for extraction in these languages is supported by the fact that there is no evidence for Infl raising in these languages. As noted in the introduction to this section, there is no asymmetry between questions and declaratives regarding the possibility of

placing the subject immediately to the right of the verb or Aux³. Since there is no evidence for Infl raising, then the left-adjacency requirement imposed on extraction can only be explained by means of raising of the question operator to the Specifier position of the head that contains inflection, IP. Hence, I conclude that Vallduví's clause structure in (33) is adequate for the subset of the Romance languages discussed in this section.

3.2. Standard Italian

Standard Italian differs from Iberian Spanish/Catalan/Romanian in that it doesn't require strict adjacency between a fronted Focus and inflection:

- (39) (Domani,) QUESTO (a Gianni) gli dovrete dire.
 '(Tomorrow,) THIS (to Gianni) we should say'

Question operators, by contrast, obey the left-adjacency requirement in root questions:

- (40) (Domani) che cosa (*a Gianni) gli dovremmo dire?
 '(Tomorrow) what (to Gianni) we should say?'

Rizzi's main argument that question operators target Spec-Foc in Italian is based on the observation that question operators in main questions are incompatible with Focus-movement:

- (41) *Focus and Wh-phrase are incompatible*
 a. *A GIANNI che cosa hai detto (, non Piero)?
 'TO GIANNI what did you tell (, not to P.)?'

³ In Catalan the only possible order in questions is VOS, so there is no evidence that V raises past inflection:

- (8) a. *Què ficarem nosaltres al calaix?
 what put-FUT-1p we in-the-drawer

- b. *Che cosa A GIANNI hai detto (, non Piero)?
 ‘What TO GIANNI did you tell (, not to Piero)?’

However, in a footnote, Rizzi observes that, in embedded questions, a *Wh*-element is marginally compatible with a focalized element.

- (42) ?Mi domando A GIANNI che cosa abbiano detto (, non a Piero)
 ‘I wonder TO GIANNI what they said (,not to Piero)
 [Rizzi 1997]

(42) suggests that there is a position for question operators which is independent from Spec-Foc and in fact lower than Spec-Foc. Thus, the observed complementary distribution between Focus and *Wh*-elements is only a root phenomenon. Now note that examples such as (42) open the way to an alternative account of the differences between Focus and question operators. We know that topics may immediately follow Focus in Italian. If question operators target a position that is lower than Focus, then it is not surprising that topics should precede question operators. Schematically:

- (43) (Topics) [Focus (Topics) [Wh ...

Clearly, under (43) we lose an account of why Focus and question operators are incompatible in root questions, but there are other plausible explanations for this restriction which don’t necessarily rely on competition for the same structural position (see footnote 5). At any rate, for the moment, it suffices to observe that whenever a Focus and a question operator may cooccur in standard Italian, the question operator appears lower than Focus and immediately adjacent to inflection, which suggests that there is an available landing site for question operators to the right of Foc.

‘What will we put in the drawer?’

Even though in embedded questions in Italian the preferred order is V-topic-wh, V-*Wh*--topic order is not completely out:

- (44) a. Mi domando, il premio Nobel, a chi lo potrebbero dare.
 'I wonder, the Nobel Prize, to whom we should give it'
 b. ?Mi domando a chi, il premio Nobel, lo potrebbero dare.
 'I wonder to whom, the Nobel Prize, we should give it'

Similar effects are observed with pre-verbal subjects:

- (45) a. ??Mi domando cosa Gianni ha fatto.
 Me ask-1sg what John has done
 'I wonder what John has done'
 b. Mi chiedo cosa Gianni faccia adesso.
 Me asked what John do-subj. now
 c. ?Mi chiedo cosa Gianni fara' in quel frangente
 me asked what John do-future now [Poletto 1997]

In Rizzi's I-to-F approach, these violations of the left-adjacency requirement in Italian are due to the fact that I-to-Foc is weakened in embedded environments. Poletto 1997, however, discusses evidence that suggests that the marginal status of (44b, 45a,c) is independent from verb movement. In some northern Italian dialects that have subject clitic inversion in root questions, a complementizer is obligatory in embedded interrogatives and there is no subject clitic inversion.

- (46) a. Gianni quando vienlo?
 G. when comes-he
 b. I me ga domandà Gianni quando che el vien.
 SCL me have asked G. when that SCL comes
 c. ??Me domando cossa che Nane ga fato casa
 me ask-1sg what that N. has done at home

Clearly, the verb in (46b,c) has not raised to the CP system. Yet, (46c), with a subject intervening between the complementizer and the verb is marginal. Poletto concludes that this effect on preverbal subjects is not connected to verb movement. Poletto also discusses examples with intervening topics.

- (47) a. Ghe go domandà *el posto* quando che i ghe lo da
 To-her have asked the position when that SCL to-her it give
 b. ??Ghe go domandà quando *el posto* che i ghe lo da

(47b), with indicative mood and a topic immediately to the right of the question operator, is degraded (compare (47b) with its standard Italian counterpart (44b)) and becomes more acceptable “if the *Wh*-element is strongly focalized as the interpretation becomes one of correction as the wrong information has been given, i.e. I am asking when and not how.”

Clearly, these intuitions are entirely compatible with the assumption that the *Wh*-element in (47b) is itself focalized (in Spec-Foc), with the topic to its right. In view of the fact that (47a) lacks the focused reading, I conclude that in (47a) the *Wh*-element occupies a position that is distinct from Spec-Foc. With this conclusion in mind we now turn to the standard Italian examples in (44). Apart from the absence of the complementizer and the difference in mood, which is probably responsible for the slightly more degraded status of (47b), the standard Italian example (44b) is parallel to (47b). I conclude that, in standard Italian too, the marginal availability of the order *Wh*- topic is due to the marginal possibility of focusing the *Wh*-element itself rather than to “weakening” of I-to-C movement. This conclusion entails that, in the non-marginal case (44a), the question operator occupies a lower position, to the right of the lowest position for topics, namely XP in the shema in (43) above⁴.

⁴ The Northern Italian examples show without question that the landing site for the question operator is not the Spec of the Infl head that contains the verbal cluster. Below I will argue that, in standard Italian,

Recall that Iberian Spanish and Romanian differ from Italian in requiring strict adjacency between a Focused phrase and inflection. Now suppose that the difference between Italian and Iberian Spanish/Catalan/Romanian is that Italian has an independent Focus head above IP, whereas Spanish lacks a projecting head in between Force and IP (see Zubizarreta 1998 for a somewhat similar proposal). In Spanish the Spec of the highest Infl head is the landing site for all sorts of A'-movement: *Wh*-movement, Focus movement and fronting of those expressions that cannot be discourse topics. In Italian, by hypothesis, Focus movement and QP fronting target Spec-Foc, in which case a topic or a subject may intervene between the phrase in Spec-Foc and inflection. Schematically:

(48) Italian:

C [Topic* [**Focus/QP** [[Foc] [Topic* [_{IP} [_{I'} [_I V] ...]]]]]]

(49) Spanish/Catalan/Romanian

[_{CP} C [Topic* [_{IP} **wh\ +Op QP/Focus** [_{I'} [_I V] ...]]]]

Above we suggested that, whenever a subject or a topic is allowed to intervene between the *Wh*-element and inflection in Italian, the *Wh*-element is itself focalized, sitting in Spec-Foc. Under the hypothesis that the structure of the left-periphery in Romanian and Iberian Spanish lacks FocP as an independent head, the absence of the order *Wh*-topic/subject-V in these languages follows.

Now we turn to the issue of the landing site of non-focalized *Wh*-elements in Italian. As argued, this position is lower than Foc and adjacent to the inflected verb. Since, as discussed, there is no clear evidence from standard Italian that inflection raises up to the C system in questions, it would appear that the logical move is to propose that the specifier position of the highest Infl head is the landing site for *Wh*-movement in standard Italian too.

question operators target the Spec of highest Infl head. However, the dialects require additional structure in view of the fact that they have obligatory subject clitics and these need to be in the checking domain of Infl (see footnote 8 for discussion).

Under this proposal, the Italian example (50a), where a focalized phrase and a *Wh*-phrase cooccur, would be analysed as in (50b), with the *Wh*-element sitting in Spec-IP and the Focused phrase sitting in Spec-Foc:

- (50) a. ?Mi domando A GIANNI che cosa abbiamo detto (, non a Piero)
 ‘I wonder TO GIANNI what they said (,not to Piero)
 b. ?Mi domando [_{FOCP}A GIANNI[_{Foc}’ [_{Foc} ∅] [_{IP}che cosa [_I’ abbiamo ...]]]]

Assuming that the *Wh*-criterion holds in the syntax in Italian, and that the locus of the *Wh*-feature is Infl (as in fact is suggested for root clauses by Rizzi 1991) then the *Wh*-criterion is satisfied by attraction of the *Wh*-operator to Spec-IP. This proposal has the advantage of unifying Italian and the other Romance languages discussed: the *Wh*-criterion is satisfied against Infl in all cases. The superficial differences detected between Italian, on the one hand, and Catalan/Romanian/Iberian Spanish, on the other, are due to independent differences in the structure of the left-periphery. Italian has an intermediate Focus head between C and IP. Catalan/Romanian/Iberian Spanish lack this intermediate head⁵.

The hypothesis that question operators are attracted to Spec-IP in Italian, Romanian, Iberian Spanish and Catalan raises two issues. The first one regards the status of Finiteness. The second one regards the status of Spec-IP. Recall that Rizzi argued in favor of a split CP system for Italian, minimally

⁵ Under the analysis developed in the text, we lack an explanation for why Focus and question operators are incompatible in root questions in Italian:

- (i) *A GIANNI che cosa hai detto (, non Piero)?
 ‘TO GIANNI what did you tell (, not to P.)?’

However, it is not unreasonable to assume that, in order for a root sentence to have interrogative force, the propositional content of the sentence must be under the scope of the head marked [+wh]. According to the analysis proposed in the text, (i) is analysed as follows:

- (ii) [A GIANNI [_{Foc}’ [_{Foc}] [che cosa [_I’ [_I +wh hai] [_{VP} ...]]]]]

In (ii) the highest head is [+Focus], not [+wh], so (ii) doesn’t have interrogative force and violates Full Interpretation. In the case of an embedded question, matters are different due to semantic selection. Since the main verb semantically selects [Question], it suffices that the embedded clause satisfy the *Wh*-criterion for Full Interpretation to be satisfied.

consisting of a Force head and a Finiteness head. Topic, Focus occupy the space between C and Fin:

(51) Force (Topics) (Focus) (Topics) Fin IP

According to (51), there are in principle two specifier positions to the left of inflection in Italian and below topics or focus, namely Spec-IP and Spec-Fin. For Rizzi, Spec-IP is an A-position and is immediately preceded by Fin. According to the structure that I have proposed for Italian in (48) there is only one specifier position to left of inflection and below topics or focus, namely the specifier position of the highest Infl head. Moreover, this position is the landing site for question operators. Up to now I have not addressed the status of Fin. None of the structures in (48, 49) contemplate this position, so now the question arises of how Fin should be integrated in our system. This issue will be taken up in the next section.

3.3. Finiteness and Inflection

In this section I will examine the status on Finiteness in light of evidence from Romanian subjunctives, which are introduced by a particle that has the same distribution as Italian *di*. I will argue, on the basis of distributional evidence, that the Romanian subjunctive particle *sa** is adequately analysed as the lexicalization of Rizzi's Fin. The curious property of this particle is that, unlike Italian *di*, it occurs in finite environments, that is, in constructions that may take an overt subject. Thus, Romanian provides us with the environment needed to test Rizzi's hypothesis according to which Fin selects an IP in whose specifier a pre-verbal subject may land. Rizzi's hypothesis predicts that a subject may intervene between Infl and Fin: if subjects raise to Spec-IP and Fin selects IP, then nothing in principle would prevent the order Fin-Subject-Infl. Drawing on work by Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, we will see that a subject may not intervene between the subjunctive particle

and the verbal cluster. In effect, nothing except clitics may intervene between this particle and inflection. Thus, Rizzi's prediction is not met. I will interpret these facts as indication that Fin belongs to the inflectional system: it is the highest head in the inflectional system, so Spec-Fin should rather be analysed as Spec-IP, with Fin belonging to a complex Infl. Spec-IP is the landing site for question operators and fronted Focus, so it is an A-bar position. The status of Spec-IP as an A-bar position will be argued to be connected to the Null Subject Property.

Consider the following Romanian sentence:

- (52) As3 vrea *ca* mîine *sa** vina* Ion .
 (I) Would want that tomorrow *sa** come-3sg-SUBJ John
 'I would want John to come tomorrow'

In (52) there are what look like two complementizer particles: *ca* and *să*. The particle *să* has been the topic of much debate in the literature (see Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, Terzi 1993, Rivero 1987) since it appears to have some of the properties of a complementizer as well as some of the properties of an Infl head.

Dobrovie-Sorin mentions a number of properties that distinguish *să* from Infl particles and bring it closer to regular complementizers: (a) *să* is invariable; (b) *să* can head an embedded clause; (c) its position is leftmost, necessarily preceding clitics and negation. This is illustrated in (53):

- (53) a. Vreau *să* **nu-l** mai întîlnesti.
 [I] want *să* not him again meet-you
 b. *vreau **nu** *să* -l mai întîlnesti
 c. *vreau **îl** *să* mai întîlnesti
 d. vreau **nu-l** *să* mai întîlnesti

In spite of sharing these properties with complementizers, *sa** bears a strong coherence with the verbal cluster. As (54a) below shows, an overt subject may not appear in between *să* and the verbal cluster. It can appear post-verbally (54b), or it appears to the left of *să* (54c):

- (54) a. *Vreau ca pînă mîine să Ion termine cartea asta.
 [I] want that until tomorrow *să* John finish this book.
- b. Vreau ca pînă mîine să **termine** Ion cartea asta.
 [I] want that until tomorrow *sa** finish John this book.
- c. Vreau ca Ion *să* **vîna**
 [I] want that John *să* come

Dobrovie-Sorin shows that *să* necessarily precedes the other elements of the verb cluster; the maximal string that may separate it from the verb is Neg-cl-Adv-Aux and these elements are themselves strictly adjacent to the inflected verb.⁶ Thus the particle *să* shares properties both with complementizers and with Infl elements. On the one hand, nothing except negation and clitics can intervene between it and the verb, subjects in particular may not intervene. On the other hand, we need to assume that *să* is sufficiently high in the structure to precede all the other elements in the Infl cluster. For this reason, Dobrovie-Sorin proposes that *să* heads its own projection and selects a spec-less IP (and perhaps NegP).

Now note that the distribution of *să* is remarkably similar to *di*, Rizzi's Finiteness head. *Di* also precedes negation and, according to Rizzi, nothing can intervene between it and the verb besides negation:

- (55) *Penso di, a Gianni, dovergli parlare.

⁶According to Dobrovie-Sorin the Aux position is occupied by the perfect auxiliary *fi* 'be' and under Adv we find a restricted class of clitic adverbs: *mai* 'again', *prea* 'too'.

Recall that the main piece of evidence that motivated Rizzi's distinction between Force and Finiteness was the distribution of topics. Topics obligatorily follow the declarative complementizer in Italian, but they obligatorily precede *di*. Now interestingly, topics obligatorily appear between the complementizer and *să*:

- (56) Doresc *ca* pe Ion *să* -l examineze Popescu
 [I] wish that *pe* Ion *să* -him examine Popescu

Thus *să* has the same distribution as *di*. For many authors, *să* stands for mood and heads a Mood Phrase (Terzi 1992 and Rivero 1987). Elsewhere, I have argued that *să* is adequately characterized as a the lexicalization of Finiteness (Barbosa 1995), so it is quite plausible that it fills the same abstract head as Italian or French *di* (see Wada 1998 for this claim). Taking Fin to be the spell out of the feature [\pm Finite], *să* represents the positive value for this feature whereas Italian *di* represents its negative value.

Without going into the question of whether Fin selects a Spec-less TP, I will simply assume that Fin is the highest head in the inflectional system. Recall Rizzi's insight that Fin establishes the interface between the inflectional system and the CP system. Based on the observation that, in Romanian, a lexical subject may not intervene between *sa** and the verbal cluster, I suggest that Fin is the highest head of the inflectional system, which is equivalent to suggesting that Fin selects a Spec-less IP or NegP. Taking I to be a cover term for "set of inflectional heads", I include Fin in this set. Fin is the highest T head in the inflectional system. Now I will address the issue of the status Spec-Fin. Besides topics and subjects, *să* can also be immediately preceded by focused expressions or question operators:

- (57) a. Vreau ca MÎINE să vină Ion .
 [I] want tomorrow să come John.
 'I want John to come tomorrow'
- c. Nu stia unde să plece.
 Not know-3SG where să go
 'He doesn't know where to go'

We saw earlier that Focus and question operators require strict adjacency with inflection. Topics do not. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that Spec-Fin is the landing site for Focus and question operator movement. Now the question arises of whether pre-verbal subjects also raise to Spec-FinP in Romanian.

Interestingly, Romanian has a test that clearly shows that pre-verbal non-focalized subjects behave like topics: the distributional properties of the subjunctive complementizer *ca*. This particle has a very curious distribution. In the absence of any material in the front of *să*, *ca* is preferably absent:

- (58) a. ?? aș vrea ca să -l examineze Popescu pe Ion.

Ca becomes obligatory in case there is a subject (59), a sentential adverb (60a) or a dislocated object (60b) in front of *să*

- (59) Vreau *(ca) Ion să vină
 [I] want that John să come
- (60) a. Vreau *(ca) mâine să vină Ion .
 [I] want tomorrow să come John.
 'I want John to come tomorrow'
- b. Doresc *(ca) pe Ion să -l examineze Popescu
 [I] wish pe Ion să -him examine Popescu

However, *ca* can be left out when the element preceding *să* is focalized, and this observation also applies to subjects (61b,c)⁷:

- (61) a. Vreau (ca) MÎINE *să* vină Ion .
 [I] want tomorrow *să* come John.
 'I want John to come tomorrow'
- b. Vreau (ca) ION *să* vină
 As3 vrea (ca) numai Ion *să* vină la petrecere
 [I] want that only Ion *să* come to the party
 'I want only John to come to the party'

Thus, we observe that pre-verbal (neutral) subjects pattern with dislocated elements and sentential adverbs in requiring the presence of *ca*. Pre-verbal focused subjects, on the other hand, pattern with Focalized adverbs or objects. The analysis developed by Vallduví for Catalan extends rather naturally to this paradigm. Recall that Vallduví adopted the VOS hypothesis for Catalan and argued that pre-verbal neutral subjects in Catalan were 'left-detached', just like other 'left-detached' objects. The Spec-IP position was the landing site for A-bar movement. Extending Vallduví's proposal to Romanian we have the following structure for (59), where *Ion* is a left-dislocated topic doubled by resumptive *pro*:

- (62) Vreau *ca* [_{FinP} Ion₁ [FinP *să* vină *pro*₁]]

(61b), by contrast, is analysed as an instance of subject extraction from the post-verbal position to Spec-FinP (an A-bar position):

⁷ These examples are due to Manuela Ungureanu, p.c. Similar data can also be found in Rivero 1987. There appears to be some dialectal variation in the possibility of dropping *ca* in front of Focus. Although some speakers may drop *ca* in front of focused elements (but cannot drop it in front of topics), some others cannot drop it in front of focus either. I thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out to me.

(63) Vreau [FinP ION₁ [Fin' să vină t₁]]

This extension of Vallduví's analysis of Catalan to Romanian entails that the A-position for subjects in Romanian is to the right of the verb. Unlike Catalan, however, Romanian allows for VSO order. It is a well known fact that the Romance languages vary with respect to the position of post-verbal subjects relative to other arguments (see Sola 1992, Zubizarreta 1998 for an overview). This variation is not directly relevant though. What matters for now is to show that, in Romanian as well as in Catalan, there is a subject position to the right of the verb. In both cases, the pre-verbal field is divided into the position that is adjacent to the verbal string, which is an A'-position, and the recursive position for topics. Base-generated topics include CLLded subjects or objects and sentential adverbs. (64) represents the structure of the left-periphery in Romanian:

(64) [C [IP topics [IP Focus/wh/QPs [I' Fin+I+V ..[]]]]

(64) is essentially the structure proposed in the previous section for Romanian/Catalan/Iberian Spanish, except that Fin is now incorporated in the structure as the highest head in the inflectional system.

Now we turn to Italian. In the previous section we claimed that Italian differs from Catalan/Romanian/Iberian Spanish in having an independent Focus head between C and the highest Infl head. Assuming that Fin is the highest Infl head, I suggest the following structure for Italian, where topics are base-generated to the left of FocP or to the left of IP:

(65) [C [FocP topics [FocP [Foc] [IP [topics [IP [I' Fin+I+V] ..[]]]]]]

Recall that I have argued that question operators in Italian are attracted to Spec-IP, so now the question arises of whether Spec-IP is an A-position in

Italian. Elsewhere, I have argued that Vallduví's observations regarding the status of Spec-IP as an A'-position in Catalan should be extended to all of the Null Subject Languages (Portuguese and Italian included) (see Barbosa 1995, to appear). I argued that the real A-position for subjects in all of the NSLs is to the right of the raised verb and that pre-verbal subjects in the NSLs are either left-dislocated topics (doubled by a resumptive *pro* in post-verbal position) or A'-moved to the front of the clause, in which case they must bear contrastive focus intonation unless they belong to the class of expressions that cannot be topics (that is, if they are bare QPs or negative QPs).

Barbosa 1995, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998 and Pollock 1997 suggested that agreement in the NSLs is +N/D, thus being capable of checking the EPP under incorporation with T. From this it follows that the lexical subject may remain in situ. This is why Spec-IP is never the landing site for A-movement in the NSLs. Here I have discussed evidence from Romanian, Iberian Spanish and Catalan that reinforces this view. Since an argumentation in favor of this claim for Italian would take me too far afield, I refer the reader to Barbosa 1995, 1996b for further arguments.

Under the view that subjects never raise to Spec-IP in the Null Subject languages, then this position is available as the landing site for *Wh*-movement and there is no need to assume V-to-C in Italian too. If the locus of the *Wh*-specification is the highest T head (as in fact is suggested for root clauses by Rizzi 1991) then, by shortest move, *Wh*-elements raise to Spec-IP. Italian being a NSL, the EPP is checked against Fin under incorporation and Spec-IP is free to host *Wh*-elements.

In order to complete my argument regarding the status of Spec-IP as the landing site for A'-movement in the NSLs, I will now briefly turn to European Portuguese (henceforth EP).

3.4. European Portuguese

EP lacks Focus movement but has fronting of affective operators and ‘non-referential’ quantified expressions of the kind discussed by Vallduví for Catalan. QP-fronting can be distinguished from *Topicalization* or CLLD by the position of object clitics (see Duarte 1983, Martins 1994, Barbosa 1995, to appear, Raposo 1994, Uriagereka 1995 for detailed discussion). QP fronting patterns with *Wh*-fronting in requiring the order cl-V. CLLD and *Topicalization*, by contrast, trigger the order V-cl:

- (66) a. *QP-movement:* Cl-V
 Algo **te** disseram para que te tenhas incomodado tanto.
 Something (Maria) to-you said (Maria) for you to be so upset.
 ‘Maria must have told you something for you to be so upset!’
- b. *Wh-movement::* Cl-V
 Quem **te** disse isso?
- (67) *CLLD:* V-Cl
 a. A Maria apresento-**ta** amanhã.
 the Maria introduce-to-you-her tomorrow
 ‘Maria, I’ll introduce her to you tomorrow’
- b. *A Maria **ta** apresento amanhã.
- (68) *Topicalization:* V-Cl
 a. [A Maria]_i apresento-**te** ec_i amanhã.
 M. I’ll introduce to you ec tomorrow
- b. *[A Maria]_i **te** apresento ec_i amanhã.
 M. I’ll introduce to you tomorrow

In Barbosa (1993, 1996a, to appear), I argued that the different patterns of clitic placement in EP can be accounted for once we assume that QP-fronting and *Wh*-movement involve A’-movement, whereas CLLD and

Topicalization involve base-generation of the overt topic in a position of adjunction to the XP that is predicated of it. In the particular case of *Topicalization*, I assume Raposo's 1996 a,b analysis, according to which the gap in argument position is the trace of an empty operator which serves as an open position whose reference is fixed by the topic. The topic itself is directly merged in front of the clause (but see Duarte 1987 for an alternative analysis):

(69) [A Maria] [Op_k [apresento-te t_k amanhã]]

QP-fronting in EP patterns with Italian Focus movement in allowing a topic to intervene between the extracted phrase and inflection (Duarte 1987):

(70) Pouco afecto, aos meus filhos, nunca darei!
 little affection, to my children never will-give
 'Little affection, to my children, I will never give.'

Now in EP it is possible to have two fronted QPs in the left periphery of the clause and the subject can appear sandwiched in between the two:

(71) [Nem ao seu melhor amigo]₁ a Maria [alguma ajuda]₂ ofereceu t₂ t₁ !
 not even to her best friend the Maria some help offered

Clearly, the subject in (71) is not sitting in Spec-IP. In view of examples such as (70), where a topic appears in between a fronted phrase and inflection, nothing prevents (71) from being analysed as an instance of subject dislocation (with the DP *a Maria* being base-generated as topic doubled by a resumptive *pro*-subject). Under such an analysis the negative phrase occupies the Spec position of a higher head, the subject occupies the intermediate topic position and the lower fronted object occupies a lower position. Thus, there are two landing sites for A-bar movement to the left of inflection and topics may occupy the space between them. (71) is straightforwardly analysed once

we let A-bar movement target Spec-IP. The non-specific indefinite raises to Spec-IP; the topic construed with the subject is adjoined to IP and the higher negative phrase is in Spec-CP:

- (72) $[_{CP} [_{Nem\ ao\ seu\ melhor\ amigo}]_1 [_{C'} [\emptyset] [_{IP} A\ Maria\ [_{IP} [alguma\ ajuda]_2 [_{I'}\ ofereceu\ t_2\ t_1\]]]]]]$

Hence in Portuguese too Spec-IP can be the landing site for A-bar movement.

Non *d*-linked question operators require strict adjacency with inflection in root clauses in EP:

- (73) Quando (*a Maria) chegou (a Maria)?
when (the M.) arrived (the M.)

Since the specifier of the highest Infl head can be the landing site for A-bar movement in EP, nothing prevents a root question from being analysed as involving movement of the question operator to Spec-IP. The subject sits in its base-position:

- (74) $[_{IP} [quando]_y [_{I'} [_{I_1} [chegou]_k] [_{VP}\ t_k\ a\ Maria\ t_y\]]]]$

Under Rizzi's 1991 hypothesis that the *Wh*-feature in root clauses is located in Infl, obligatory adjacency between the fronted phrase and inflection follows from attraction of the *Wh*-element to the specifier of the head containing the *Wh*-feature and we do not need to assume V-to-C. Hence, Portuguese and the other languages discussed use the same strategy to check the *Wh*-feature in root clauses⁸.

⁸ The assumption that pre-verbal "subjects" in the NSLs are topics doubled by subject *pro* predicts that a subject should be able to precede question operators in root questions. This prediction is fulfilled:

(i) A Maria quando virá?
the Maria when will-come

So far, I have only discussed the Null Subject languages. Interestingly, it can be argued that *Wh*-elements may target Spec-IP in Romance even in a non-NSL such as French. This will be discussed in the next section.

3.5. French

French has a variety of ways to construct interrogative clauses (see Kayne 1975, 1984, Kayne and Pollock 1978, Hulk 1993, Drijkoningen 1997 and DeWind 1995). Of interest to us here is the variety of Standard French, where inversion of the subject is required in interrogatives. Three types of inversion can be distinguished in Standard French: Complex Inversion, Pronominal Inversion and Stylistic Inversion. Pronominal inversion is illustrated in (75):

- (75) Quand est-elle venue?
 when is-she come

In (75) the pronominal clitic subject appears between the auxiliary and the verb. In French, Aux-subject inversion is restricted to pronominal clitics. When the subject is non-pronominal, it can never invert with the auxiliary in French. It either appears in VP-final position or at the front of the clause, in which case it must be doubled by a clitic. These two constructions are illustrated below:

- (76) *Complex Inversion:*
 Quand Marie est-elle venue?
 when M. is-she come

In addition, this hypothesis predicts that, whenever the subject is one of those expressions that cannot be discourse topics, it should not be allowed to precede the question operator. Recall that we argued that these expressions are extracted by A'-movement when they appear pre-verbally, so they should be in complementary distribution with a fronted question operator. This prediction is also fulfilled, as shown below:

- (ii) a. *Alguém quando virá?
 someone when will-come

(77) *Stylistic Inversion*

Quand est venue Marie?

when is come M.

The variant without the clitic, Stylistic Inversion (SI) is different from Pronominal Inversion (PI) and Complex Inversion (CI). Stylistic Inversion has two distinctive features. The first one is that the subject, which is always nominal, is in VP-final position. The second distinctive feature of SI is that it is permitted in root clauses as well as in embedded clauses:

(78) Je me demande quand est venue Marie.

I me ask when is come M.

Pronominal Inversion and Complex inversion, by contrast, are restricted to root environments:

(79) a. *Je me demande quant est-elle venue.

b. *Je me demande quand Marie est-elle venue.

Kayne and Pollock (1978) proposed that SI is derived by a rule that moves the subject to the right. More recently, a number of researchers have argued that the subject in SI sits in its base-position, inside the VP (see Deprez 1990, and De Wind 1995). Since the evidence presented by these authors is rather compelling, I will adopt their proposal without further argument. Regarding the issue of the landing site of the question operator in SI, there is some indication that the *Wh*-constituent in Stylistic inversion targets Spec-IP. I will review this evidence next.

One of the most striking features of SI is that it depends on whether a constituent is fronted in the syntax. Thus, SI is unavailable in yes-no questions, but is fine when an argument is fronted:

- (80) *Viendra Jean?
Will-come J.?
- (81) Qui a vu Jean?
who has seen J.
'Who did J. see?'

The contrast above suggests that the following generalization holds: SI is possible just in case the specifier position of some designated head is filled in overt syntax (see Kayne 1984 for discussion). Note that the ungrammaticality of (80) is not due to failure of Nominative Case assignment to the post-verbal subject: in (81) the subject doesn't raise and yet it has Case. According to the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995, 1998), the principle that requires that the specifier of a designated head be filled in overt syntax is the EPP, not Case. Note that equivalents to (80) are fine in the Null Subject Romance languages. Under the view of the *pro*-drop parameter sketched in the previous section, what characterizes the *pro*-drop languages is the fact that agreement has the ability to check the EPP. Thus, in the NS equivalents to (80) the EPP is checked. In French, however, agreement doesn't have this capacity, so (80) violates the EPP.

Assuming that (80) is out because the EPP fails to be checked, then it follows that the fronted constituent is capable of checking the EPP in (81). In other words, it follows that the fronted constituent in (81) raises to the specifier position of the head that contains the EPP feature. According to standard assumptions, this head is the highest Infl head. Hence, I suggest the question operator is attracted to Spec-IP, where it checks *both* the EPP and the *Wh*-feature in Infl. In line with the Minimalist Program, I assume that the EPP and Nominative Case are dissociated. In (81) the Case and *phi*-features of the subject are checked at LF; the EPP is checked by the question operator.

Note that whenever SI applies in embedded questions, a topic may not intervene between the *Wh*-item and inflection:

- (82) *Je me demande bien à qui, de temps en temps, telephone Marie.
[Deprez 1990]

The impossibility of (82) is parallel to the Romanian, Catalan and Iberian Spanish examples discussed above. A common explanation can be given as soon as it is assumed that, in Romance quite generally, Spec-IP *can* be the target for *Wh*-movement. This hypothesis captures a wide range of facts concerning *Wh*-triggered inversion in this language family while immediately accounting for the absence of the cluster of properties typical of Germanic Aux-Subject inversion, namely the lack of root/embedded asymmetries and the impossibility of the order Aux-Subject-V.

4. *Categorial selection, complementizers and parameterization*

Even though French SI has properties that are common to *Wh*-triggered inversion in Catalan, Romanian, Iberian Spanish and Italian, these languages differ from French in one important aspect. In embedded questions in French the SI option (82a) co-exists with the option with no inversion (82b):

- (82) a. Je me demande bien à qui telephone Marie.
b. Je me demande bien à qui, de temps en temps, Marie telephone

Recall that the counterparts to (82b) are bad in Iberian Spanish, Catalan and Romanian and marginal at best in standard Italian. Portuguese is very much like French in this regard: in embedded questions, the order *Wh*-subject-V is possible (see Âmbar 1988) and co-occurs with the inverted option (158a):

- (83) a. Sabes **quando** *a Maria* chegou?
 Know-2sg when the M. arrived
 b. Sabes **quando** chegou *a Maria* ?
 Know-2sg when arrived the M.
 ‘Do you know when Mary arrived?’

In addition, a sentential adverb or a topic PP may appear immediately to the right of a question operator in embedded questions:

- (84) a. Sabes **a quem**, de vez em quando, *a Maria* telefona?
 Know-2sg to whom, every now and then, the M. calls
 ‘Do you know who, every now and then, Mary calls?’
 b. Sabes **a que horas**, ao Pedro, mais lhe convirá lá ir?
 Know-2s at what time, for Peter, more to-him would-be-convenient to go there
 ‘Do you know at what time it is more convenient for Peter to go there?’

(83a) and (84a,b) can only be analysed in terms of attraction of the question operator to the CP system.

Recall Rizzi’s 1991 *Wh*-criterion. According to that formulation, a *Wh*-phrase must be in a Spec-head relation with a clausal head marked +wh. For Rizzi, there are in principle two loci for the *Wh*-specification on a clausal head: (i) the head that contains the independent tense specification of the +interrogative sentence; (ii) the embedded C, where the occurrence of the *Wh*-specification is determined by lexical selection.

This formulation of the *Wh*-criterion enables Rizzi to account for the root/embedded asymmetry observed in Germanic. In root clauses, I must raise to C so that the required configuration is obtained. In embedded clauses, C is the head marked [+wh] via lexical selection.

Now consider French (or Portuguese) in light of this formulation of the *Wh*-criterion. In root clauses, the head that contains the *Wh*-feature is the highest T head (Fin). Since, as argued, Spec-IP can host question operators, the *Wh*-criterion is trivially satisfied at the IP level. In embedded clauses, however, two options appear to exist. C may be the locus of the *Wh*-feature, in which case it attracts the *Wh*-phrase:

- (85) Je me demande bien [_{CP} à qui [_C [C] [_{IP} de temps en temps]] [_{IP} Marie
telephone t_i]]]

or Fin/I is the locus of the *Wh*-feature, in which case the *Wh*-item is attracted to Spec-Fin/I, yielding SI:

- (86) Je me demande bien [_{IP/FinP} à qui telephone Marie]

Now consider Catalan, Iberian Spanish and Italian. In these varieties, embedded C doesn't seem to ever be the locus of the *Wh*-feature, or we would expect to find the order *Wh*-Topic/Subject-Fin as we do in French or Portuguese. This order, however, is ungrammatical in Catalan/Romanian/Iberian Spanish and marginal in Italian, as extensively discussed above. Instead we find the order Topic -*Wh*- Infl as the favored one:

- (87) a. Mi domando, *il premio Nobel*, **a chi** lo potrebbero dare?
'I wonder, the Nobel Prize, to whom they could give it'
b. No sé *en Joan* **quan** el veuré.
Not know.1s the J. when him will-I-see
'Joan, I don't know when I'll see him'
[Sola 1992:224]

Above we have seen that a topic may not immediately precede the subordinator complementizer *che* in Italian, so (87) can only be analysed with the topic adjoined to a projection that is lower than C:

(88) Mi domando [_{CP} [_C \emptyset] [il premio Nobel [a chi lo potrebbero dare]]]?

Thus, it is fair to conclude that C is *not* the locus of the *Wh*-feature in this language set. In French and Portuguese, by contrast, embedded C can be the locus of the *Wh*-specification. Before we propose a formulation of the parameter responsible for this difference between French/Portuguese and Italian/Catalan/Romanian/Iberian Spanish, the following question needs to be addressed: when I is the locus of the *Wh*-specification, is CP projected? Recall that, according to Rizzi, Force and Fin are invariably projected. This being so the stylistic inversion example in (82a) is analysed as in (89):

(89) Je me demande bien [_{CP} [_C C] [_{IP/FinP} à qui telephone Marie]]]

For Rizzi, the CP status of the embedded clausal projection is required by the selectional requirements of the main verb. However, one should examine this argument more carefully and consider what is meant by “selection”. Recall that, in Rizzi’s 1991 formulation of the *Wh*-criterion, in embedded contexts, C is [+wh] in virtue of selection. However, the *Wh*-phrase in (89) is overtly attracted to a projection that is lower than C, so it can’t be the case that the *Wh*-feature is located in C. Selection for particular terminal nodes or features contained in them (*lexical*-selection, in the sense of Pesetsky 1992) is generally strictly local, so C should be the head bearing the selected feature, contrary to fact. Thus, it is highly unlikely that I-selection is what imposes CP status on an embedded question.

Semantic selection doesn’t appear to be relevant either. Grimshaw (1979) shows that semantic selection is satisfied at LF, so the issue of which of the clausal heads, C or Fin, is specified as [+wh] is not relevant for semantic

interpretation. This observation entails that *categorial* selection is the only mechanism of the grammar that requires embedded questions to be CPs. However, there is good reason to doubt that c-selection plays a role as an autonomous mechanism in the grammar (see Pesetsky 1982, 1992 and Boskovic 1996).

Boskovic 1996, in particular, has argued explicitly that as long as CP status is not required by lexical properties or other constraints independent of c-selection, clausal complements may be IPs. One of the arguments he uses is based on the Romanian facts discussed above. Recall the restrictions on the distribution of the subjunctive complementizer in Romanian. The generalization underlying the distribution of *ca* appears to be that *ca* is obligatory as long as there is a topic in the left-periphery of the clause. Thus, *ca* is obligatory just in case a topic (including subject topics) precedes *să* even though it may be omitted with a pre-verbal focus in some dialects:

- (90) a. Vreau *(ca) *mîine să termine* Ion cartea asta.
 [I] want that tomorrow *să* finish John this book.
- b. Vreau (ca) *MÎINE să vină* Ion .
 [I] want tomorrow *să* come John.
 'I want John to come tomorrow'

In the absence of any material in the front of *să*, *ca* is preferably absent:

- (91) Vreau *să termine* Ion cartea asta.

The contrast between Focalization and topics suggests that what is at stake here are the X-bar theoretical notions: *substitution* vs. *adjunction*. Relying on this difference and on the assumption that adjunction to an argument is banned (Chomsky 1986, McCloskey 1996), Boskovic (1996)

suggests that the distribution of *ca* is captured once we let complements of volitionals in Romanian be bare IPs. Boskovic proposes that, whenever *ca* is absent, CP doesn't project. Thus, in (91) the complement of the volitional verb is a bare IP:

(92) vreau [_{IP} *să termine* Ion cartea asta]

Assuming that FinP may be a complement of the volitional verb in Romanian and that topics are in a configuration of adjunction, (93a) below is straightforwardly ruled out by the ban on adjunction to an argument:

(93) a. *Vreau *mîine* *să termine* Ion cartea asta.
 b. Vreau [_{IP} *mîine* [_{IP} *să termine* Ion cartea asta]]

(94a), which contains a focused adverbial, is analysed as in (94b), with substitution into Spec-FinP.

(94) a. Vreau *MÎINE* *să vină* Ion
 b. Vreau [_{FinP} *MÎINE* [_{Fin'} *să vină* Ion]]

In order for a topic to appear in the left-periphery of a selected subjunctive clause in Romanian, CP must be projected, yielding (95):

(95) Vreau [_{CP} *ca* [_{IP} *mîine*] [_{IP} *să termine* Ion cartea asta]]
 [I] want that tomorrow *să vină* finish John this book.

This means that CP status is not imposed by selection, but rather by an independent principle, namely the ban on adjunction to an argument. Hence, I conclude that Boskovic's proposal to eliminate categorial selection as an autonomous mechanism of the grammar has strong empirical support.

Recall that Rizzi suggests that the Topic-Focus field is activated whenever needed, even though he assumed that ForceP status is imposed by selection. The Romanian data, however, suggest that selection imposes no categorial restrictions on clausal projections. Eliminating c-selection while incorporating Rizzi's idea that some projections are activated when needed, I adopt Boskovic's proposal according to which C is projected whenever needed. One such case in which C must project is when a topic is adjoined to IP. In this case, C must be part of the numeration so that the derivation doesn't violate the ban against adjunction to an argument.

With this conclusion in mind, we now turn to an analysis of embedded questions in Romance. Recall that French and Portuguese had two options in embedded questions, one with "inversion" and the other without "inversion". I will use French for illustration:

- (96) a. Je me demande bien à qui telephone Marie.
 b. Je me demande bien à qui Marie telephone.

If we let embedded clauses be CPs or IPs, then we account for the existence of both options. In (96b) C is projected and the subject is sitting in Spec-IP, where it checks the EPP. The *Wh*-feature in C attracts the *Wh*-phrase:

- (97) Je me demande bien [_{CP} à qui [_{C'} C_{+wh}] [_{IP/FinP} Marie telephone]]]

In (96a) no CP is projected, the embedded clause is a bare FinP(=IP). Fin is specified +wh and the *Wh*-phrase is attracted to Spec-IP:

- (98) Je me demande bien [_{IP/FinP} à qui telephone Marie]

Note that the configuration in (98) is also a possibility in all of the other Romance languages. As long as there is no topic adjoined to IP, nothing prevents a bare IP from being a complement of the higher verb, so the

Portuguese example (99a) (as well as any of its equivalents in Iberian Spanish, Romanian, Italian and Catalan) may very well be analysed as in (99b), with the *Wh*-item in Spec-IP and the subject in post-verbal position:

- (99) a. Sabes **quando** chegou *a Maria* ?
 know-2sg when arrived the M.
 ‘Do you know when M. arrived?’
 b. Sabes [_{IP} quando [_{I'} [chegou] [_{VP} ... a Maria]

Whenever a topic is adjoined to IP (or Spec-IP is filled by a quantificational operator of the sort discussed by Vallduví), CP must project, in which case the *Wh*-element is attracted to Spec-CP:

- (100) a. Sabes **a que horas**, ao Pedro, mais lhe convirá lá ir?
 Know-2s at what time, for Peter, more to-him would-be-
 convenient to go there
 ‘Do you know at what time it is more convenient for Peter to
 go there?’
 b. Sabes [_{CP} a que horas [_{C'} [_C] [_{IP} ao Pedro] [_{IP} mais lhe
 convirá lá ir]]

Now recall that the order V-*Wh*-topic/subject-Infl is bad in Catalan and Iberian Spanish and marginal in Italian. Instead, we find the order V-Topic-*Wh*-Infl:

- (101) Mi domando, il premio Nobel, a chi lo potrebbero dare?

In (101) we see a topic in the left periphery of the clause in addition to a *Wh*-phrase. This means that the embedded clause must be a CP, or else the topic would be adjoined to an argument:

(102) Mi domando [_{CP} [_C Ø] [il premio Nobel [a chi lo potrebbero dare]]]?

On the assumption that *Wh*-movement is triggered by feature checking, the fact that *C* is not an attractor for *Wh*-arguments in Italian/Iberian Spanish and Catalan can only be due to its featural make up. I suggest that the null complementizer in Italian/Iberian Spanish/Catalan embedded interrogatives is unspecified with respect to the feature [\pm wh]. That certain complementizers appear to be “transparent” with respect to the *Wh*-feature is evidenced by the complementizer *che* in Catalan (and also Spanish), which is compatible with an embedded question:

(103) *Catalan*:

- a. Pregunten **que** la feina **qui** la farà.
ask.3p that the work who it fut.3s.do
Lit. ‘They are asking that the work who will do?’
‘They are asking who will do the work’
- b. Pregunten **que** el Lluç **qui** va veure.
Lit. ‘They are asking that Lluç who saw.’
‘They are asking who Lluç saw’ [Vallduví 1992:118]

It can’t be the case that *que* in (103) is [-wh] or there would be a feature mismatch at LF. This particular behavior of *que* appears to be an idiosyncrasy of Catalan and Iberian Spanish since examples such as (141) have not been described for most of the other Romance languages. I interpret this observation as an indication that the featural make up of *C* may vary cross-linguistically. In Spanish and Catalan the overt complementizer *que* is not specified for the feature [-wh]. Now, by hypothesis, Italian has a null counterpart to Spanish and Catalan *que*. Italian null *C* is not specified with respect to [\pm wh]. Hence, it is never an attractor for *Wh*-phrases, while being compatible with a question embedded under it:

- (104) Mi domando [_{CP} [_C \emptyset] [_I il premio Nobel [a chi [_I [+wh] lo potrebbero dare]]]]?

In (104) null C cannot be [-wh], since there would be a feature mismatch with [+wh] T. Our hypothesis here is that null C is not specified for [+wh] either and hence it never gets to be an attractor for *Wh*-phrases. Catalan and Spanish appear to also have a null counterpart to *que*, since examples similar to Italian (104) are fine in Catalan and Spanish.

Above we claimed that C is a *Wh*-attractor in French and Portuguese. This means that C in these languages is specified with respect to [+wh]. I propose that the parameter that distinguishes French/Portuguese from Italian/Catalan/Iberian Spanish is the following: in the latter, null C is unspecified with respect to [\pm] wh; in the former, C must be specified as [\pm wh].

Now consider what happens when C in French or Portuguese is [-wh]. In theory, there are two possibilities: either -wh C is spelled out or -wh C can be null. In either case, C, being specified as [-wh], should not be able to embed an IP with a +wh phrase in its Spec, due to feature mismatch. This observation predicts that French or Portuguese should not have equivalents to Italian (104) or to Catalan (103). In effect, this prediction is borne out:

- (105) a. *Je me demande à Jean, ce que lui a donné Marie.
 I me ask to John, what to him has given M.
 ‘I wonder, to John, what has given M.’
 b. *Je me demande que à Jean, ce que lui a donné Marie.
- (106) a. *Sabes ao Pedro **quando** mais lhe convirá lá ir?
 know-2SG to-the P. when more to-him is convenient to go there
 ‘Do you know, for Peter, when it is more convenient to go there?’
 b. *Pergunto-me que, ao Pedro, quando mais lhe convirá lá ir.

(105a) and (106a) show that a topic may not immediately precede an embedded *Wh*-question in French or Portuguese. Above we argued that a topic can only precede IP whenever C projects. If C projects, then it must be specified as $[\pm \text{wh}]$. Suppose C is $[\text{+wh}]$. Then it should attract the *Wh*-phrase and (105a), (106b) crash because the *Wh*-feature in C fails to be checked in overt syntax. Now suppose that C is $[-\text{wh}]$ and null. (105a), (106a) are also predicted to be bad, due to feature mismatch: $[-\text{wh}]$ C is incompatible with $[\text{+wh}]$ I. Finally, suppose that $[-\text{wh}]$ C must be spelled out, yielding (105b), (106b). Such a configuration should also be rule out due to feature mismatch.

Thus, the hypothesis that the featural content of C is what distinguishes French/Portuguese from Italian, Catalan or Spanish rightly predicts that the possibility of *Wh*-attraction to Spec-CP should correlate with the impossibility of adjunction to an IP with a *Wh*-phrase in its Spec⁹.

The only question that remains to be addressed now is how C is endowed with the *Wh*-feature in embedded environments in EP and French on the assumption that categorial selection plays no role in the grammar. Pesetsky 1992 notes that regardless of whether c-selection is eliminated, we need selection for terminal elements, which he refers to as *lexical selection*. L-selection does not refer to syntactic categories; it rather makes reference to individual lexical items, such as particular prepositions or specific features

⁹ This generalization can be phrased as a conditional:

- (i) If a language has overt *Wh*-movement to Spec-CP and to Spec-IP, then it shouldn't allow adjunction to an IP with a *Wh*-phrase in its Spec.

Note that (144) is not a bi-conditional, that is, the impossibility of adjunction to an IP with a *Wh*-phrase in its Spec doesn't necessarily entail that the language in question also has overt movement to Spec-CP. A case in point are Romanian *sa** subjunctives. Romanian has a complementizer that is exclusively used in subjunctives: *ca*. This complementizer is incompatible with an embedded question:

- (ii) Nu stia (*ca) unde *sa** plece.
 Not know-3SG that where *sa** go
 'He doesn't know where to go'

(ii) shows that *ca* must be negatively specified for the *Wh*-feature. When *ca* is omitted, the embedded clause is a bare IP, so we predict that a topic should not be allowed to adjoin to the embedded subjunctive. The difference between Romanian subjunctives and Italian, Catalan or Spanish is that the

such as $[\pm \text{finite}]$. Thus, I suggest that, once C is part of the numeration, $[+\text{wh}]$ C is selected by the verbs that semantically select Question [Q]. Lexical-selection for $[+\text{wh}]$ C occurs only in those languages where null C is specified for $[\pm] \text{wh}$, such as EP, French or English. In Italian, Spanish or Catalan, null C is unspecified with respect to $[\pm \text{wh}]$, so the question of selection for a particular value of this feature on null C doesn't arise.

5. *When Root Questions are CPs*

Even though the featural content of subordinating C brings French and Portuguese together, the non-*pro*-drop nature of French sets it apart from all the other Romance languages discussed including Portuguese. Since French is non-*pro*-drop, pre-verbal subject constructions are genuine instances of subject raising to Spec-IP. Thus, in a question, a conflict arises between the requirement to check the *Wh*-phrase and raising of a non-*wh* subject in overt syntax. A non-*Wh*-subject checks the EPP but cannot check the *Wh*-feature in Fin. This conflict is all the more problematic in those cases where the subject is a pronominal clitic. French weak pronouns (in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke 1994) cannot stay *in situ*, so whenever the numeration contains a weak subject pronoun, Stylistic Inversion is not an option:

- (107) *Quand est venu-t-il?
 when is come he

According to the framework of assumptions developed so far, the only *Wh*-questions in which a non-*Wh* subject is allowed to raise in the syntax are those in which C is part of the numeration. In French, as argued, lexically selected C is always specified as $[\pm \text{wh}]$. Consequently, CPs embedded under a verb that semantically selects [Question] will always involve checking of the

latter have a null C that is underspecified with respect to the feature $[\pm \text{wh}]$; Romanian lacks such a null complementizer, at least in subjunctives.

Wh-feature against [+wh] C. This enables the subject to raise in overt syntax, as happens in (108a) below:

- (108) a. Je me demande bien à qui elle telephone.
 b. Je me demande bien [_{CP} à qui [[_C +wh] [_{IP} elle telephone]]

Now consider the predictions that our theory makes in the case of root questions with a weak pronoun as subject or a pre-verbal lexical non-*wh* subject. Recall that, in root questions, I is the locus of the *Wh*-feature (lexical selection fails to license a +wh C), so even when C projects and the *Wh*-phrase raises up to C, the *Wh*-criterion will not be satisfied:

- (109) [_{CP} Wh [[_C Ø] [_{IP} Subject/pronoun [[_I [+wh]]]]]

In (109) the *Wh*-criterion fails to be checked, so the derivation doesn't converge, yielding the following sentence, which is bad in standard French, the variety we are analysing:

- (110) *Quand Marie/elle est venu?
 when M. /she is come

Now (109) is exactly the context that yields Subject-Aux inversion in English. However, Infl raising doesn't appear to be an option in French, as evidenced by the fact that (111) is out:

- (111) *Quand est Marie venue?

Instead of (111) or (110) what we find is the construction known as Complex Inversion:

(112) *Complex Inversion*

Quand Marie est-elle venue?

The impossibility of (111) has led a number of authors to the conclusion that I-to-C does not apply in French (Noonan (1989), Drijkoningen 1997, Hulk 1993 and De Wind 1995). The leading idea behind the analyses of Complex Inversion developed by these authors is that it arises whenever both the *Wh*-operator and the subject need to check their features against the features of the *same* functional head (Infl, according to our analysis). Here I will not propose an analysis of this construction. For my present purposes it suffices to observe that Complex Inversion (as well as Subject Clitic Inversion) is the instantiation of the option of expanding a C node¹⁰. This option has a different guise in root questions as opposed to embedded questions in virtue of the fact that, in root questions, C is not the locus of the *Wh*-feature. The fact that the other Romance languages discussed lack Complex Inversion follows from the Null Subject property: since subjects do not raise to Spec-IP to check an L-related feature, the configuration in (109) does not arise in a Null Subject language ¹¹.

¹⁰ Other Romance varieties that have Subject Clitic inversion are the northern Italian dialects discussed in Poletto (1997). These have *obligatory* Subject Clitic inversion in root questions even though they lack Complex Inversion. In embedded clauses the clitic may be pre-verbal. These dialects differ from French in that subject clitics are invariably present and do not alternate with a lexical subject. Elsewhere, I have argued that pre-verbal subject constructions in these languages are instances of left-dislocation of the lexical subject: the clitic itself is a sort of incorporated pronoun, which checks the EPP feature. In this light, it is not surprising that these varieties lack Complex Inversion (the lexical subject itself doesn't raise to Spec-IP for feature checking). Since, in these varieties, subject clitics are obligatory and, by hypothesis, they need to check their nominal features against Infl, *Wh*-movement may not target Spec-IP. Hence, *Wh*-questions in these varieties must project up to the CP level regardless of whether they are root questions or embedded questions. An analysis of the dialects is obviously outside the scope of the present paper. Anyway, the major point I wish to make here is that, in the dialects, both root and embedded questions cannot be bare IPs due to the obligatory presence of subject clitics.

¹¹ Even though the NSLs lack Complex Inversion, there are cases in which root questions project up to the CP level. This is the case of root questions in which the *Wh*-constituent is a partitive phrase or an adjunct:

- (i) *Portuguese* (Ámbar 1988)
Em que dia a Maria chegou?
On what day the Maria arrived
- (ii) *Spanish* (Torrego 1982)
¿Cómo Juan ha conseguido meter allí a su hijo?
'How has John managed to get his son in there?'

6. *Conclusions*

In this paper, I argued that the crucial property that distinguishes Romance from Germanic is that [+wh] Infl does not raise up to the C. I argued that *Wh*-criterion *can* be checked against the highest Infl head in all of Romance and that the *Wh*-feature may be located in Infl in root as well as in embedded clauses. In addition, I presented evidence in support of Bos*ovic*'s 1996 proposal according to which clausal projections may be bare IPs unless further structure is independently required. Since the *Wh*-criterion can be satisfied at the IP level in Romance, root questions may be bare IPs. Obligatory adjacency between Infl and the *Wh*-constituent follows.

Following recent proposals (Barbosa 1995, Pollock 1997, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998) according to which the Null Subject Languages are languages in which rich agreement checks the EPP and the N-features of Infl, I claimed that, in these languages, Spec-IP is not an A-position. In the absence of A'-movement to Spec-IP, Infl doesn't project a specifier. This property accounts for certain differences between French and the other Romance languages. In the latter, Spec-IP doesn't necessarily need to be filled in overt syntax. In French, however, the EPP can only be satisfied by overt raising to Spec-IP.

One important difference distinguishes French from English, however. In French, the EPP feature doesn't necessarily need to be checked by a subject: a *Wh*-phrase in Spec-IP may satisfy *both* the *Wh*-criterion and the EPP. Hence, both root and embedded questions may be bare IPs in French as long as the subject is allowed to stay in situ.

De Wind 1995 and Dobrovie Sorin 1990 suggest that partitive *Wh*-phrases are base-generated directly in Spec-CP. Rizzi 1990 makes the same claim for certain *Wh*-adjuncts. Thus, in these particular constructions, the CP layer is projected, in which case a topic subject may intervene between the *Wh*-phrase and the *Wh*-phrase in Spec-CP. In sum, root questions in Romance may be bare IPs unless a CP layer is independently required.

Embedded questions can in principle be bare IPs in all of the Romance languages under discussion (*Wh*-checking can be done against the highest T head). They can also involve additional layers depending on whether the Topic\Focus layer is activated. The cross-linguistic variation detected with respect to the relative position of the lexical subject and the *Wh*-constituent is due to variation in the structure of the ‘left-periphery’, combined with the featural make up of complementizers in the inventory of each language. I argued that in Italian, Catalan and Spanish, null C is underspecified with respect to the feature $[\pm]$ *wh*. Consequently, it is never the locus of the feature $[+wh]$ and hence it is never an attractor for *Wh*-arguments; on the other hand, the presence of a null C in these languages doesn’t interfere with semantic selection, since C is “transparent” with respect to the feature $[\pm]$ *wh*. As a result, *Wh*-arguments must invariably raise to Spec-IP, including in those derivations where the clausal argument is a CP. This accounts for the obligatoriness of subject inversion in embedded questions in Catalan and Spanish. The marginal acceptability of Italian embedded questions with *Wh*-S-V order is due to the availability in this language of a FocusPhrase between C and IP, which may under certain conditions host a *Wh*-phrase in its Spec. In Portuguese and French, subordinating C is fully specified for the feature $[\pm]$ *wh*, so whenever embedded questions project up to the CP level, $[+wh]$ C is lexically selected, thus attracting the *Wh*-operator, yielding the order *Wh*-S-V.

Even though root questions may be bare IPs in Romance, additional structure (a CP layer) may be required. In French, root questions must be CPs whenever a non-*Wh*-subject raises overtly and checks the EPP feature in Infl. Since Spec-IP is not available for the *Wh*-element, CP must project so as to host the *Wh*-element in its Spec. This yields the constructions known as French Complex Inversion and Subject Clitic Inversion.

If these conclusions are right, then the question arises of why, in English (or in Germanic, quite generally), the option of checking the *Wh*-feature against the highest Infl head is not available. I leave this problem for further research.

6. References

- Âmbar, M. 1988. *Para uma Sintaxe da Inversão Sujeito Verbo em Português*, PhD. diss., University of Lisbon, Lisbon.
- 1998. Towards a definition of CP - evidence from TopicFocusP and EvaluativeP. Talk presented at Going Romance 1997, Groningen.
- Adams, M. 1987. From Old French to the Theory of *pro*-drop. *NLLT* 5: 1-32.
- Alexiadou, A. and H. Anagnostopoulou. 1998. 'Parameterizing AGR: Word Order, V-movement and EPP checking'. *NLLT* 16: 491-539.
- Barbosa, P. 1993. Clitic Placement in Old Romance and European Portuguese. *CLS 29: Papers from the Twenty-Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*.
- 1995. *Null Subjects*. PhD. dissertation. MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- 1996a. Clitic placement in European Portuguese and the position of subjects. *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*, ed. by A. Halpern & A. Zwicky, 1-40. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- 1996b. In defense of right adjunction for head-movement in Romance. *Configurations: Essays on structure and interpretation*, ed. by Anna - Maria Di Sciullo, 161. Somerville, Mass: Cascadilla Press.
- 1996c. A new Look at the Null Subject Parameter. In Costa J., R. Goedemans & Ruben van de Vijver (orgs.) *Proceedings of ConSole IV*. Leiden, The Netherlands: 375-395.
- (to appear). Clitics: a Window into the Null Subject Property. In João Costa (ed.), *Essays in Portuguese Comparative Syntax*. New York: Oxford Press.
- Belleti, A. 1990. *Generalized verb movement*. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Bonet, E. 1990. Subjects in Catalan. *MIT Working Papers* 13, 1-26. Cambridge, Mass.

- Boskovic*, Z. 1996. Selection and the categorial status of infinitival complements., *NLLT* 14, 269-304.
- Cardinaletti, A. & M. Starke. 1994. The typology of structural deficiency: On the three grammatical classes. [Ms., Univ. of Venice and Univ. of Geneva/MaxPlanck Berlin.]
- Chomsky, N. 1977. On *Wh*-movement. *Formal Syntax*, P. Culicover, T. Wasow and A. Akmajian (eds.), 71-132. New-York: Academic Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1998. *Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework*. MITWOPL. Cambridge: MIT.
- Cinque, G. 1990. *Types of A'-dependencies*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Contreras, H. 1991. On the position of subjects. *Syntax and Semantics*, 25, Academic Press.
- Deprez, V. 1990. Two ways of moving the verb in French, *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 13, 47-85
- De Wind, M. 1995. *Inversion in French*. PhD diss. Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1990. Clitic Doubling, *Wh*-movement, and quantification in Romanian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:1-25.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1994. *The syntax of Roumanian: Comparative studies in Romance*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Duarte, I. (1983). Variação Paramétrica e Ordem dos Clíticos. *Revista da Faculdade de Letras de Lisboa* 50: 158-78.
- Duarte, I. 1987. *A construção de topicalização na gramática do português: regência, ligação e condições sobre movimento*. University of Lisbon, PhD. Dissertation.
- Drijkoningen, F. 1997. Morphological Strength: NP positions in French. Dorothee Berman, David LeBlanc, Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Rightward Movement*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Grimshaw, J. 1979. Complement Selection and the Lexicon. *Linguistic Inquiry* 10, 279-326.
- Grimshaw, J. 1993. Minimal Projection, Heads and Optimality, ms. Rutgers University.
- Holmberg, H. & Ch. Platzack. 1988. The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, 42, 25-43.
- Hulk, A.C.J. 1993. Residual V2 and the Licensing of Functional Features. *Probus*: 5, 127 - 154.
- Hulk, A.C.J. & A. van Kemenade. 1990. Licensing V2, Case Systems and *Pro-drop*. *Paper presented at the First Generative Diachronic Syntax Conference*, New York.
- Iatridou, S. (1991). Clitics and Island Effects. Ms. MIT.
- Kayne, R, 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. 1984. *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Kayne, R.S. & Pollock, J. Y. 1978. Stylistic Inversion and successive Cyclicity and Move NP in French. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 595-621.
- Kayne, R. 1975. *French Syntax: the Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Klima, E. 1964. Negation in English. J. Katz and J. Fodor (eds.), *The Structure of Language*. Prentice-Hall.
- Laka, I. 1990. *Negation in Syntax: On the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Law, P. 1991. *Effects of Head Movement on Theories of Subjacency and Proper Government*, unpublished Ph.D dissertation, MIT.
- Martins, Ana Maria. 1994. *Foco e Clíticos no Português Europeu*. PhD. dissertation, University of Lisbon.
- McCloskey, J. 1996. On the scope of verb movement in Irish. *NLLT* 14, 47-104.
- Motapanyane, V. 1994. An A-position for Romanian Subjects. *LI* 25, 4, 729-734.

- Noonan, M. 1989. Operator licensing and the case of French interrogatives. Fee and Hunt (eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 315-330.
- Ordóñez, F. 1998. Post-verbal asymmetries in Spanish. *NLLT* 16: 313-346.
- Pesetsky, D. 1982. *Paths and Categories*. Ph-D. dissertation, MIT.
- 1992. *Zero Syntax*, Volume 2. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.
- Poletto, C. 1997. *The Higher Functional Field in the Northern Italian Dialects*. Ms. University of Padova.
- Pollock, J.-Y. 1986. Sur la Syntaxe de *en* et le Paramètre du Sujet Nul. Couquaux D. & M. Ronat (eds.), *La Grammaire Modulaire*, 211-246. Paris: Editions Minuit.
- Pollock, J.-Y. 1997. *Langage et Cognition: Introduction au Programme Minimaliste de la Grammaire Générative*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Radford, Andrew. 1994. The Nature of Children's Initial Clauses, unpublished manuscript, Essex University.
- Raposo, E. 1986. On the Null Object in European Portuguese. *Studies in Romance Linguistics*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Raposo, E. 1994. Affective Operators and Clausal Structure in European Portuguese and European Spanish. Ms., University of California at Santa Barbara, Calif.
- Raposo, E. 1996. Towards a Unification of Topic Constructions. Ms., University of California at Santa Barbara, Calif.
- Raposo, E. 1997. Definite/zero Alternations in Portuguese: Towards a Unified Theory of Topic Constructions. Ms., University of California at Santa Barbara, Calif.
- Rivero 1987. La teoría de las barreras y las completivas del rumano. *Sintaxis le las lenguas Románicas*, Violeta Demonte & Marina Fernández Lagunilla, eds., 329-354. Madrid: Textos Universitarios.
- Rizzi, L. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Rizzi, L. & I. Roberts. 1989. Complex Inversion in French. *Probus* 1.1, 1-30.

- Rizzi, L. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- 1991. Residual Verb Second and the *Wh*-Criterion, *Technical Reports in Formal and Computational Linguistics* 2, Faculté des Lettres, Université de Genève.
- Rizzi, L. 1986. Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of *pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 501-557.
- Rizzi, L. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Schneider-Zioga, P. 1994. *The Syntax of Clitic Doubling in Modern Greek*. PhD diss., University of Southern California.
- Sola, J. 1992. *Agreement and Subjects*, PhD dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Speas, M. 1994. Null Arguments in a Theory of Economy of Projection', University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers 17, 179-208.
- Terzi, A. 1992. *Pro in Finite Clauses, a Study of the Inflectional Heads of the Balkan Languages*, Ph.D Dissertation, City University of New York.
- Torrego, E. 1984. On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. *LI* 15, 103-129.
- Tsimpli, I. M. 1994. Focusing in Modern Greek, in K. Kiss, ed., *Discourse-configurational Languages*, Oxford University Press.
- Uribe-Etxebarria, M. 1991. On the structural positions of the subject in Spanish, their nature and their consequences for quantification. [Ms., Univ. of Connecticut.]
- Uriagereka, J. 1995. Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in western Romance. *LI* 26, 79-123.
- Vallduví, E. 1990. *The informational component*. PhD. Dissertation, UPenn.
- 1992. A Preverbal landing site for quantificational operators. CTWPL, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona.
- Wada, M. 1998. The Position of Subjects in the Clause Structure of the Null-Subject Romance Languages, *Journal of the Faculty of Letters* 29. Okayama University.

Zanuttini, R. 1989. The structure of negative clauses in Romance. *NELS* 20, pp. 517-530.

Zubizarreta, M. L. 1997. *Word Order, Prosody and Focus*. Cambridge: MIT Press.